

CPMT Review of N2 Project Inception Report

Basin: Nile

Basin Leader: Tilahun Amede

MT lead: Boru Douthwaite

KM team lead: Sophie Alvarez



Date: 6 December, 2010

Evaluation of N2- IWMI Inception Report

1 Peer Assist

The evaluation format follows the structure of the Project Inception Report

1.1 Explanations of any changes made to the Project Workbook

The N2 OLM is good. The suggestions given for adjustment on contracting to the milestone plan have been addressed, and the project seems to be moving accordingly.

The request for capacity building on development/ updating of M&E materials and reports is a good way to address the continuous improvement of the workbook.

1.2 Key project inception insights (on bottlenecks, major achievements and lessons learned?)

Given the delay in N1 delivery of lessons learned from the past, it is very important that you are proactive in ensuring key lessons are incorporated in the relevant NBDC projects.

On data limitations, is this a risk to the whole BDC?

I am happy to see that you have developed a draft diagnostic tool for assessing innovation capacity. ACTION: Please seriously consider making this baseline becomes a baseline for the whole BDC.

Of course the challenge to the coordination project is to ensure good partnership between the NBDC projects and to build a good communications and M&E system that supports adaptive management and the other core CPWF principles.

1.3 Partnerships entered into and their relevance to project and program goals

The partnerships entered into are appropriate.

1.4 Needs from CPWF (e.g., CPMT, CPWF KM team, capacity building)

Requests to design an internal communication system, to design a NBDC website and to help with developing and disseminating project outputs should be directed at the Coordination Project, not the KM team. The KM team can backstop. ACTION N5 to address requests, including requesting from backstopping from KM team.

1.5 Anything else reported

I note and support the capacity building initiative.

I agree and very much support the idea that field visits should be made jointly with other projects and national partners to build the coherence of the NBDC program of work.

1.6 General comments

A good report

2 Compliance (contract documents and financial)

2.1 Recommendation to CPMT whether to accept changes made to Project Workbook and rationale given, including whether changes requested at time of contracting have been adequately addressed (yes, no or provisional)

- *What was the BL's recommendation to the CPMT?*

From BL: Yes, they have now assigned one institution and one project member per output on the Gantt chart. However, they need to make the same adjustment to the OLM, as requested.

- *What is CPMT recommendation and commentary?*
ACCEPT
- *What must be fixed by the time of the next progress report (default, March) or in a shorter time period (specify)?*

To continue to improve the workbook and baseline document, with support coordinated by the BL.

To provide any outstanding MOUs

2.2 Recommendation to CPMT whether documents Project submitted in fulfilment of Standard Clause 3.03 are acceptable

ACCEPT with conditions specified in 2.1 above

2.3 Recommendation to the CPMT whether to accept the Project statement of receipts and expenditures including narrative summary and status report of partner disbursements and expenditures (yes, no or provisional)

- *What was the BL's recommendation to the CPMT?*

Funds used as per schedules: yes, the team used more than 60% of the budget allocated for 2010. Mostly travel and workshop costs.

- *What is CPMT recommendation and commentary?*

ACCEPT. Project holding \$88,867 from initial payment, with first tranches provided to ILRI and ICRAF.

- *What must be fixed by the time of the next progress report (default, March) or in a shorter time period (specify)?*

No requirements

2.4 Taking into account the three points above, the Project Inception Report as a whole, and other pertinent information, recommend and justify whether Project progress is satisfactory (green), unsatisfactory (amber), or whether it should be terminated (red)

- *What was the BL's recommendation to the CPMT?*

Satisfactory. Thematic leaders are encouraged to work closely and interact with the basin leader as much as possible. Recommend releasing the second instalment fully.

- *What is CPMT recommendation and commentary?*

Program Manager recommendation: **Satisfactory**

A very informative and positive report.

Date of Program Manager approval 3 December 2010

MT Lead recommendation: **Satisfactory**

Good report

Date of MT lead approval ...8 December.....